

## REMARKS

Claims 6, 11, 15, 20, 21, 22 and 23 have been amended. Claim 7 has been canceled.

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter, as well as the Examiner's comments regarding claim 1 at paragraph 18 of the Office action. In view of the Examiner's comments, the Applicants have amended the remaining independent claims in order to use the terminology of claim 1, so as to place the remainder of the application in condition for allowance. Specifically, claims 6 and 11 have been amended by replacing the term "user-defined data elements" with the terms "customized status summaries" and "customizable status summaries" respectively. Furthermore, as in claim 1, claims 6 and 11 have been amended to more clearly state that said status summaries are presented *in addition to* "user-defined functions". Support for these amendments to claims 6 and 11 can be found in claim 1, as well as in the specification at page 8, line 1 through page 9, line 24. Claims 22 and 23 have been amended to reflect the changes to claims 6 and 11, from which they respectively depend.

Claims 15 and 23 have been amended to correct informalities, as suggested by the Examiner. The preambles of claims 21 and 22 have also been amended to more clearly indicate that they are dependent claims.

### Claim Informalities

Claim 15 has been amended by replacing "selection step" with "step of selecting a profile" in order to more clearly indicate the antecedent basis in Claim 1 for this claim element, as suggested by the Examiner at paragraph 4 of the Office action.

Claims 21, 22 and 23 have been amended so that the claims begin with the definite article "The" rather than the indefinite article "A", since they are dependent claims.

Claim 23 has been recast as a system claim depending from claim 11, as the Examiner suggests at paragraph 5 of the Office action.

Objection to the Specification under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(d)(1)

The Examiner has objected to the specification for failure to clearly teach “user-defined data elements”, which appears in claims 6 and 11. The Applicants have therefore replaced the term “user-defined data elements” in those claims. In claim 6, the term “user-defined data elements” has been replaced with the term “customized status summary”. In claim 11, the term “user-defined data elements” has been replaced with the term “customizable status summary”.

Since the claims no longer include the term “user-defined data elements” the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner’s objection based on failure to provide proper antecedent basis be withdrawn.

Rejections of Claims 6 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 20 as being anticipated by Ittycheriah (U.S. Patent 5,924,070).

As described above, claims 6 and 11 now include features analogous to those features of claim 1 which distinguish claim 1 over Ittycheriah. Since claim 1 has been allowed, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6 and 11 are allowable for the same reasons, and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 6 and 11, and the claims depending therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Rejections of Claims 8, 13, 14, 19, 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claim 8 as obvious over Ittycheriah in view of Beyda (U.S. Patent 5,924,070). The Examiner has rejected claims 8, 13, 14, 19, 22 and 23 as obvious over Ittycheriah in view of Braman (International Publication WO 99/14928).

The Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 8, which depends from claim 6, as unpatentable over Ittycheriah in view of Beyda should be withdrawn since Beyda does not teach the features of claim 6 which Ittycheriah fails to disclose.

The applicants submit that the rejection of claims 8 and 22, which depend from claim 6, and claims 13, 14, 19, and 23, which depend from claim 11, as unpatentable over Ittycheriah in view of Braman should be withdrawn, Braman does not teach the features of claims 6 or 11 which Ittycheriah fails to disclose.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 8, 13, 14, 19, 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Conclusion

In view of the above arguments and amendments, the Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims in the present application are now in condition for allowance, and notice of allowance is hereby requested.

No fee is believed due for this submission. However, Applicants authorize the Commissioner to debit any required fee from Deposit Account No. 501593, in the name of Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. The Commissioner is further authorized to debit any additional amount required, and to credit any overpayment to the above-noted deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

**BRENNAN, Paul et al**

By:           /Jeffrey M. Measures/            
**Jeffrey M. Measures**  
**Reg. No. 40,272**  
Borden Ladner Gervais LLP  
World Exchange Plaza  
100 Queen Street, Suite 1100  
Ottawa, ON K1P 1J9  
CANADA  
Tel: (613) 237-5160  
Fax: (613) 787-3558  
E-mail:  
ipinfo@blgcanada.com

JMM/IAB/dbm